

The Journal of Economics and Politics

Volume 22 | Issue 1

Article 2

2015

Identity and Efficacy: Latinos in the United States

Ryan Salzman

Northern Kentucky University, salzmanr1@nku.edu

Sauna Reilly

Northern Kentucky University, reillys3@nku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://collected.jcu.edu/jep>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Salzman, Ryan and Reilly, Sauna (2015) "Identity and Efficacy: Latinos in the United States," *The Journal of Economics and Politics*: Vol. 22 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://collected.jcu.edu/jep/vol22/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Carroll Collected. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Economics and Politics by an authorized editor of Carroll Collected. For more information, please contact connell@jcu.edu.

IDENTITY AND EFFICACY: LATINOS IN THE UNITED STATES

RYAN SALZMAN AND SHAUNA REILLY

NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE EFFECT OF IDENTITY ON POLITICAL ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR IN THE UNITED STATES ARE INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT AS ITS POPULATION BECOMES MORE DIVERSE. THE PRIMARY DRIVER OF THAT INCREASED DIVERSITY IS THE EXPANSION OF THE LATINO POPULATION. MOST RESEARCH FOCUSES ON DIFFERENCES BETWEEN VARIOUS ETHNIC GROUPS. THIS RESEARCH PROJECT SEEKS TO UNDERSTAND THE EFFECT OF IDENTITY STRENGTH WITHIN THE LATINO POPULATION ON ATTITUDES ABOUT GOVERNMENT. USING THE 2006 LATINO NATIONAL SURVEY, THE ROLE OF IDENTITY ON EFFICACY IS EXPLORED. THE RESULTS INDICATE THAT EFFICACY AMONG LATINOS IS RELATED TO IDENTITY. WE ALSO FIND RESULTS THAT REINFORCE THE PRESENCE OF CLASSIC INFLUENCES ON EFFICACY SUCH AS SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT.

INTRODUCTION

What role does identity have on Latino voters' efficacy in the U.S. electoral system? The role of efficacy in voting is undisputed. In addition to the numerous contextual and political characteristics that influence efficacy, researchers highlight differences between ethnic groups nationwide. Taking the efficacy-identity research a step further, this paper focuses on variation in identity strength within a specific ethnic group – Latinos.¹ Without considering differences within an ethnic group, the story of how identity affects efficacy remains incomplete.

The Latino population in the United States continues to expand at a rate that far outpaces other major ethnic groups. As that population grows, our understanding of Latino identity continues to develop. Latinos are not a monolithic group. Indeed, there are several dimensions within this group, including country of origin, generation of residence, naturalization vs. non-naturalization, religious, racial, linguistic, and socioeconomic differences among others (Sanchez 2006). Thus, our research serves two purposes: it illuminates our understanding of identity and efficacy in a general sense, and we gain increased insight into understanding what determines attitudes within the Latino population. The media and much political science literature argue that this group will significantly influence the electoral outcomes of the country through the next 40 years. We explore internal and external efficacy to explain the feelings of efficacy in this group and how these voters identify with their community to provide insight into this voting population.

Employing the rich individual-level survey data available in the 2006 Latino National Survey, we explore the role that ethnic identity plays in affecting feelings about the performance of government. Latino identity is articulated via self-identification as well as proxy measures. Additionally, a battery of individual-level characteristics previously shown to affect efficacy are included. We find some support for our identity-related hypothesis while reinforcing the traditional role played by other individual-level characteristics so often cited as primary drivers of efficacy.

LITERATURE

Efficacy is certainly not a new phenomenon in American political behavior. The *American Voter* (1960) and subsequent voting literature illustrates the tight link between voting and efficacy (Downs 1957; Campbell et al 1960; Campbell, Gurin and Miller 1954; Balch 1974). This was further expanded in the 1980s by an increase in research on the role that efficacy plays in the overall participation process (Wolfinger and Rosenstone 1980; Abramson 1983; Finkel 1985; Abramson and Aldrich 1982; Clarke and Acock 1989; Nownes 1992; Pattie and Johnston 1998). Respondents who feel that they have a higher level of political efficacy are more likely to follow politics, pay attention to campaigns, and discuss politics, leading to “good” citizens.

A centrally important finding in this literature is that efficacy is an important feature driving political participation in the United States. Citizens feel more connected with their government when efficacy is high and are more likely to vote and engage in their community. On the other hand, when efficacy is low we expect lower turnout and higher levels of dissatisfaction with the government. Given the participation of Latinos in the American political system, the connection with efficacy is an important area for research. The majority of this literature on efficacy focuses on the aggregate U.S. population, though there has been some research on efficacy in subgroups: sex, racial, economic class, and education. For the purposes of this study, it is important to emphasize racial subgroups when discussing efficacy.

MINORITIES AND EFFICACY

The African-American community has a storied past with efficacy in the U.S. political system. From slavery to disenfranchisement to the modern political system, alienation of the African-American population has resulted in record low participation rates. Alienation has a significant impact on participation and disconnection from the political process (Citrin et al 1975). Research indicates that racial minorities, particularly African-Americans and Latinos, are more ineffectual than white males (Michelson 2000; Abramson 1972, 1983; Long 1978; Citrin et al 1975). One important factor that contributes to the feelings of efficacy in the African-American community is context. This is particularly true with policy issues and descriptive representation (Citrin et al 1975; Howell and Fagan 1988; Abramson 1972, 1984; Abney and Hutcheson 1981; Long 1978; Rodgers 1974; Banducci, Donovan and Karp 1999; Bobo and Gilliam 1990). Additionally, high levels of political participation reduce alienation (Finifter 1970).

Looking at the Latino community, some of these same issues resonate. For instance, greater descriptive representation increases participation among Latinos (Barreto, Segura and Woods 2004). Research also highlights numerous Latino-specific factors that influence participation in American elections such as length of residence in the United States (Highton and Burris 2002; Uhlaner 1989); citizenship status (de la Garza and DeSipio 1997; Hero 1992; Uhlaner, Cain and Kiewiet 1989); and language (de la Garza and DeSipio 1997; Uhlaner 1989) and country of origin (Reilly 2012; Sanchez 2006; Michelson 2000). Although efficacy was not an explicit focus of those research endeavors, social science logic leaves open the possibility that efficacy may be a significant part of those revealed relationships that inform voting initiative.

Latinos generally are thought to have low opinions of government effectiveness and responsiveness to citizen preferences. Michelson (2000) examined the role of efficacy in the Latino community and found that this community has low levels of efficacy on the internal and external levels. Although efficacy may be low for the Latino community on average, no attempt is made to look at variation among Latinos. Specifically, research fails to differentiate identity strength, socioeconomic status, and other characteristics that are shown repeatedly to influence efficacy. In short, researchers have oversimplified this relationship by focusing on being Latino and ignoring myriad factors that may explain individuals' various efficacy levels within this growing ethnic community.

The trap of oversimplification is evidenced by the use of the various terms "race" and "ethnicity" in research through several decades. Americans of Latin-American descent can be considered a racial category, but the variation in appearance (i.e. skin color) across that group has made categorization more identity-based and thus more in line with our understanding of "ethnicity," where membership in that group is more than skin deep. The term "Latino" further evidences this evolution in classification as it is distinctly American in its origin and often relies heavily on self-identification.

INTERNAL VS. EXTERNAL EFFICACY

Efficacy is not a stagnant concept; there are multiple dimensions to the concept. Internal efficacy refers to an individual's view of being capable and competent to participate in the political system, whereas external efficacy refers to how citizens feel the government is responsive to the concern of individuals (Balch 1974). These play important roles when discussing the Latino community. Internal efficacy informs the connection between an individual's decisions to participate in their political system, and given the low voting rates of the Latino community, this seems like an important concept to evaluate through the lens of identity. Contemporary research has explored Latinos' internal efficacy but has not yet made the connection with identity (Mamani, Rosales, and Navarro 2007, Jackson 2009). External efficacy is evaluated in a variety of contexts with proven links to descriptive representation (Atkeson and Carrillo 2007). This illuminates the pronounced importance of external efficacy for minority communities (race and gender) and thus, could be expected to have a connection with the identity measures.

THEORY

The literature on efficacy and the connection between race and efficacy illustrates that there is indeed a significant relationship between racial subgroups and their political efficacy. African-Americans tend to have a solid identity that permeates the majority of their interactions with the political system. Unlike the African-American community, Latinos project diversity across their community. Points of variation include desires to acculturate, language skills, the embracement of Latino identity, and time removed from immigration, to name a few. In short, it is impossible to treat this community as a singular group, as experiences and preferences create a population much more diverse than their African-American counterparts. We suggest that because of this diversity within the Latino population, there should be some differences in their political efficacy.

The extent to which Latinos embrace their ethnic identity is a major point of potential variation. As with African-Americans, Latinos are often confronted by a U.S. political system that advances policies that alienate them (see Mangum 2003 for a full discussion of this alienation and its affect on voter turnout). Thus, Latinos who identify strongly with their ethnic brethren may take an adversarial stance towards the government as alienation begets inefficacious feelings (Pantoja and Segura 2003; Michelson 2000). Likewise, Latinos who embrace American culture and place themselves more in line with “typical Americans” may feel less alienated and thus more efficacious. There is no reason to think that strength of identity should trump other individual-level characteristics that influence efficacy (i.e. socio-economic status). Instead, it is reasonable to expect identity to be one factor among many that affect feelings about government.

Hypothesis: Latinos who self-identify or otherwise exhibit characteristics consistent with stronger Latino identity will have lower levels of efficacy.

METHOD

To test the hypothesis, this project employs survey data taken from the 2006 Latino National Survey (LNS). The LNS is a national telephone survey of 8,600 U.S. Latino residents that strives for a broad understanding of the qualitative nature of Latino political and social life. The survey’s length was approximately 40 minutes, and the exact length and number of questions per respondent depended on the citizenship, parental status, and state of residence. Interviewing Services of America conducted the surveys in the preferred language of the respondent. Surveys were administered in English, Spanish, or both languages (Fraga et al. 2006).

The universe for the survey was adult Latinos 18 years of age or older. They did not have to be U.S. citizens or voters. The geographic study initially focused on states with large Latino populations. Additional states with emerging Latino populations were also included in the survey to further capture an accurate and diverse sample of Latinos in the United States. The sample represents approximately 87.5% of the Latino population in the United States.² The unaccounted Latino populations lie in states not included in the LNS sample.

The dependent variables identify the respondent’s efficacious feelings. Each variable is a single item measure obtained from a single question in the LNS survey. To identify internal efficacy the survey question asks respondents to rate the degree to which they agree/disagree with the statement, “People like me don’t have any say in what the government does.” The response options range from “strongly disagree” (score = 4) to “strongly agree” (score = 1). The scores were reversed so that higher scores equal higher efficacy. External efficacy is captured by the survey question, “Government is pretty much run by just a few big interests looking out for themselves, and not for the benefit of all people.” The response options range from “strongly disagree” (score = 4) to “strongly agree” (score = 1). Again, the scores were reversed with higher scores equaling higher efficacy.

This project employs multiple primary independent variables and numerous control variables. The first set of independent variables overtly captures self-identity measures. *Keep Spanish* and *learn English to be American* are both divided into 4 levels of importance: not at all important (1), not very important (2), somewhat important (3), and very important (4). *Latino is distinct* measures the importance of maintaining a distinct Latino culture. This is coded from 0 being not at all, 1 being important, and 2 being very important.

The remaining independent variables are considered reliable proxies for Latino identification (see Salzman 2014). Immigrants and children of immigrants who have stronger language skills in the new country are often better assimilated (Alba & Nee, 1997). Language ability is captured with two variables. *English quality* measures the level of English-speaking ability, while *Spanish quality* measures the level of Spanish-speaking ability. The measures are scored from 0 (not at all) to 3 (very well). All respondents who requested that the survey be administered in English were given a score of 3 for English quality, while respondents who chose Spanish were given a 3 for the Spanish quality variable.

Being further removed from immigration affects identity as each generation assimilates more than the previous generation (Lieberson 1973; Gans 1992). The generational variables are each single-item dichotomous responses all coded with 0 equaling “no” and 1 equaling “yes.” A *second generation* respondent is one who answered that neither parent was born in the United States. A *third generation* respondent is one who identified that at least one of his/her grandparents was born outside of the United States, and *fourth generation* respondents are those with all parents and grandparents born in the United States. These represent proxies of socialization for our analysis as the longer someone and their family is in the United States the more likely they are to identify with the American identity rather than the Latino identity. The self-identification, language skills, and generational variables are all included to test the hypothesis.

To ensure that the model is properly specified, a number of control variables are included. The extensive list of controls illustrates the numerous factors that could systematically influence efficacy among Latinos. To test the role of economic factors, the following variables are utilized: *employed*, *own home*, and *income*.³ *Employed* is scored 0 to 2 dividing employment into part time, full time, and not employed. *Own home* is a dichotomous variable as well with a 0 given to those who do not own their home and a 1 to homeowners. *Income* is measured as the total household income reported divided into 7 income ranges, from 1 equaling below \$15,000 to 7 equaling above \$65,000.

Variation in interest, knowledge, education, and political participation can differentially affect efficacy. *Interest in politics* tests whether the respondent is not interested (0), somewhat interested (1), or very interested (2) in politics and public affairs. *Political knowledge* is an additive index of various items intended to capture formal and informal political information. The questions asked the respondent to identify which party controls Congress, who won their state’s electoral votes in 2004, and which party is more conservative. For each correct response the respondent receives a score of 1. Incorrect responses receive a score of 0. The scores are then added together to create a *political knowledge* index that ranges from 0 to 3. *Education* measures the degree of formal education that a person received and is assigned scores between 0 (none) and 7 (graduate or professional degree).

Research has consistently shown a high degree of correlation between various political attitudes and behaviors (Almond and Verba 1963). As such we include numerous measures of political behavior to ensure the proper specification of the model. *Civic engagement* and *contact government* measure the frequency of actions taken to participate in civic group activities and contact a government official. Both variables are divided into three levels of frequency: no actions (0), one action (1), and two or more actions (2). *Vote* is a dichotomous variable measuring whether a respondent has voted either within the United States or in their country of origin. *Registered to vote* is scored positively (1) only if the person is registered within the United States. If the respondent is not registered to vote in the United States, they are assigned a value of 0. *Democrat* and *Republican* are variables used to identify if a person considers himself/herself a Democrat or Republican. These variables are obtained from a single question within the LNS survey that

asks respondents if they self-identify as a Democrat, Republican, Independent, or other. Those respondents who answered “Democrat” were given a value of 1; all other responses were assigned a 0 value for the Democrat variable. The same method was used for the Republican variable assigning those who answered “Republican” a value of 1 and all other responses a value of 0. *Independent* serves as the excluded category to which the other two partisan variables are compared. Finally, two variables are included to capture citizenship. One identifies citizens born in the United States, *U.S. Citizen – Native*. The other focuses on citizens born elsewhere but naturalized. Both variables are coded dichotomously with 1 being “yes” and 0 being “no.”

Some additional basic control variables consistently linked to various individual attitudes and behaviors (see Almond & Verba 1963) are included to ensure that the correct relationships are identified as well as to increase the robustness of the models. These include *male* and *age*. *Male* measures the sex of the respondent and is coded as either yes (1) or no (0). *Age* is assigned a continuous value in years. The range of ages in this study is from 18 to 97.

Finally, the respondent’s country of origin is included in the analyses to ensure that society-specific culture and institutions do not systematically bias the responses. The variables identify the country in which the respondent was born. U.S. birth is the excluded variable to which the other country dummy results should be compared.

To conduct the analyses of the dependent variables, standard ordered logistic models are employed. This model was chosen because the dependent variables are ordered and finite (Long and Freese 2006). The results of the statistical models reveal the direction and the statistical significance of the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variables of interest.

ANALYSIS

The results of the statistical analyses are presented in Table 1 and Table 2. The models performed well with pseudo- R^2 values of 0.0120 and 0.0189 respectively. The models include variables that capture respondents’ identity as well as numerous individual-level control variables. The results indicate minimal support for the hypothesis that only one of the *Identity* variables is statistically significant in the anticipated direction in each model.

Of the seven variables included to capture Latino identity in the Internal Efficacy model (Table 1), only *Latino is distinct* exhibits statistical significance, and even then the level of significance is relatively weak ($p=0.085$). The direction of the relationship conformed to our expectations as Latinos who agreed with the statement that it is important to maintain a distinct Latino ethnicity exhibit less internal efficacy. Varying the value for *Latino is distinct* from its minimum to its maximum value increases the likelihood of a respondent reporting low efficacy by 14%. This is not a huge number, but it does illustrate a distinct shift in internally efficacious attitudes as a result of a commiserate shift in that identity measure. As discussed in the theory section, a stronger association with Latino identity may be closely associated with feelings of alienation inspired by U.S. government policies. In short, our results demonstrate that there is a positive and significant relationship between Latinos seeing themselves as distinct and having less say in what the government does. The remaining overt self-identification measures and proxy measures are unrelated to respondents’ feelings regarding their ability to influence government action. That is, language importance, language skills, and generation of residency in the United States are each statistically insignificant.

The control variables performed well, confirming that Latinos’ internal efficacy is influenced by characteristics which, according to prior research, affect all Americans’ efficacy. This also supports the use of this question as the dependent variable to gauge internal efficacy; however, the results were mixed and deserve further description. Of the three variables included to capture respondent economic conditions, only *Income* is statistically significant. The results indicate, albeit only weakly, that as incomes increase among Latinos so, too, do their feelings about having a say in what the government does. Employment and home ownership are statistically insignificant.

Being interested in politics is positively related to internal efficacy, as is education. Thus, as Latinos gain education and interest in politics they feel increasingly as if they have a say in what government does. Interestingly, having more or less knowledge about politics is statistically indiscernible from zero. This finding is surprising because interest in politics, education, and political knowledge are often highly correlated with one another. Explanations for why political knowledge is insignificant may be rooted in the question quality. Regardless, there is support for more educated and interested Latinos being more internally efficacious.

Respondents' participation in politics is related to their feelings about having a say in what the government does, but the results are not consistent for all participation. The most basic form of political participation, voting, is statistically unrelated to respondents' internal efficacy. The same is true for being registered to vote. More involved participation, such as being civically engaged and contacting government officials, appears to inspire positive feelings about having a say in what the government does. Partisanship matters, but only for Republicans as being Democrat is unrelated to Latinos' internal efficacy. Being Republican is positively associated with feelings about government responsiveness relative to being politically independent.

There is reason to suspect that noncitizens would feel most alienated from the political system and therefore believe that they have no say in what the government does. Additionally, there could be a difference in efficacious feelings depending on the process for acquiring citizenship (nativity versus naturalization). Our results indicate that U.S. citizenship, regardless of how it is acquired, is statistically unrelated to internal efficacy among Latinos. Likewise, internal efficacy is not systematically related to the respondent's birth country. This is evidenced by the statistical insignificance of the country dummy variables.

The age variable reveals that as respondents get older, they have a negative and significant relationship with the dependent variable. This means that as Latinos get older they realize that they have less say in government. Gender is unrelated to internal efficacy among Latinos.

When we run the model for external efficacy (Table 2), we find similar results with a few notable distinctions. Weak support is found for the hypothesized negative relationship between Latino identity and external efficacy. Respondents with greater support for retaining Spanish in the household more vehemently endorse the statement "government is pretty much run by just a few big interests looking out for themselves, and not for the benefit of all people." Computing predicted probabilities reveals a 25% increase in the probability (31% to 39%) that Latinos report agreement with the statement capturing external efficacy when their support for keeping Spanish in the household is varied from its minimum to its maximum. Thus, there is at least some evidence that Latino identity is negatively related to external efficacy. All of the other overt and proxy identity measures were statistically unrelated to external efficacy except respondents' Spanish language skills. That individual characteristic is positively correlated with external efficacy. That is, Latinos who speak Spanish well exhibit stronger feelings of external efficacy than Latinos who do not speak Spanish well. English language skills are unrelated to external efficacy providing little clarity for this confounding result.

None of the economic measures are statistically correlated with Latinos' external efficacy attitudes. This is different from the internal efficacy test where greater income is positively correlated with efficacy, however, the weak findings in the first model do not contradict the findings in the external efficacy model.

There is significant disagreement between the two efficacy models as it relates to political interest, education, and political knowledge. Table 2 reveals a statistically significant negative relationship between political knowledge and external efficacy. A similar result is present for education and external efficacy. Thus, it appears that more educated and knowledgeable Latinos endorse the idea that big interests run the U.S. government. In the internal efficacy test, more interested and educated Latinos felt that they had a greater say in what government does. Although these results vary across the two tests, the agreement of the results within each test increases the reliability of the statistical analysis. Therefore, there is something

about how Latinos see government, big interests, and the role of individuals in democracy that must explain these differential outcomes. The results definitely reinforce the severability of internal and external efficacy and the fact that interest/knowledge/education may affect each differently.

Looking at the role of political participation, similar results are present in both analyses. Neither voting nor being registered to vote, both more superficial in their participatory experience, is relatable to efficacy of any kind. External efficacy is negatively correlated with Latinos' efforts to contact government. Again, more involved participation elicits a correlation, but this time the relationship is in the opposite direction. Latinos who contact government are more likely to endorse the idea that big interests run government. Unlike internal efficacy, civic engagement is statistically insignificant. Partisanship again matters, but only for Republicans, as being Democrat is unrelated to Latinos' internal efficacy. Being Republican is positively associated with feelings about government responsiveness relative to being politically independent.

Latinos who are naturalized U.S. citizens are more likely to agree with the idea that the U.S. government is run by big interests. Native U.S. citizens have no statistically discernible relationship with external efficacy. The remaining control variables, age and gender, are statistically insignificant. For the birth country dummy variables, only Uruguay is statistically significant.

CONCLUSION

This research project explores the role that identity plays in shaping Latinos' efficacy in the United States. Employing rich survey data capturing a quality sample of the Latino population in the United States, we tested our hypothesis while including numerous control variables representing characteristics found to influence efficacy among all Americans. The identity variables illuminated a weak connection with Latinos' opinions about how much say they have in what the U.S. government does and the role played by big interests in governing.

We had reason to believe that, unlike African-Americans, Latinos' identity was highly variable and would thus differentially affect their political attitudes in general, and efficacy in particular. To ensure that Latino identity was well represented, we included three self-identifying ethnic identity variables and five proxy identity variables. For internal efficacy, only the variable capturing the perceived importance of "Latino" being a distinct classification is statistically significant. Latinos with stronger feelings about emphasizing that distinction felt as though they had less say in what the government does. Even then, the relationship is weak. Despite the high degree of variation across the identity variables, attitudes about having a say in government action appears little affected.

External efficacy is also negatively affected by identity as attitudes endorsing a desire to keep Spanish as a primary language in the household are correlated with stronger feelings that big interests dictate government behavior with the subsequent changes in predicted probabilities being noteworthy. There is some consistency for self-identification measures, but this consistency is undermined by the proxy identity variable measuring Spanish language skills of the respondent. Latinos who speak Spanish well are less likely to endorse the idea that big interests dictate governance than individuals who do not speak Spanish well. Despite this disagreement, we endorse the weak findings that support our hypothesis. The self-identification measures are more important for testing our hypothesis than the proxies included.

A centrally important albeit tangential finding of this research is the support of prior research for this specific population. Our findings confirm prior research on efficacy and see that traditional indicators of efficacy – involvement in the community, economic factors, knowledge and interest – also influence Latino efficacy. The direction of the relationships was not always consistent across the two statistical tests; however, they are consistent within each test. This result lends support to the idea that internal and external efficacy should both be considered, but separately. Given the burgeoning population of Latinos in the United States, confirming general efficacy research may go a long way to helping us determine how Latinos

fit into our understanding of American behavior. It is intuitive to take our research to the next level to compare Non-Latinos and Latinos to one another rather than just an in-group comparison.

TABLE 1: ORDERED LOGISTIC MODEL OF INTERNAL EFFICACY

	Say So in Gov't ^a	
<i>Identity</i>		
Keep Spanish	-0.056	(0.052)
Learn English to be American	-0.033	(0.070)
Latino is distinct	-0.088*	(0.051)
Spanish Quality	0.030	(0.046)
English Quality	-0.039	(0.035)
2 nd Generation	0.267	(0.252)
3 rd Generation	0.095	(0.270)
4 th Generation	0.168	(0.273)
<i>Controls</i>		
Employed	-0.022	(0.030)
Own Home	-0.074	(0.055)
Income	0.026*	(0.015)
Interested in Politics	0.096**	(0.039)
Political Knowledge	0.037	(0.026)
Education	0.065**	(0.016)
Civic Engagement	0.084*	(0.043)
Contact Government	0.060*	(0.031)
Vote	0.044	(0.061)
Registered to Vote	0.051	(0.095)
Democrat	-0.025	(0.056)
Republican	0.400**	(0.082)
US Citizen - Naturalized	0.083	(0.096)
US Citizen – Native	0.182	(0.321)
Male	0.009	(0.051)
Age	-0.006**	(0.002)
Country Dummy Controls ¹	not significant	
Pseudo-R ²	0.0120	
N	5,680	

TABLE 1 NOTES

Source: 2006 Latino National Survey

^asurvey question: “People like me don’t have any say in what the government does.”

Numbers in parentheses indicate standard errors of the parameter estimates.

*p≤.10; **p≤.05

¹The Country Dummy variables included in this model identify the birth country of each respondent. US Birth is the excluded category to which each other Country Dummy is compared. None of these are statistically significant.

TABLE 2: ORDERED LOGISTIC MODEL OF EXTERNAL EFFICACY

	Big Interests Run Gov't ^a	
<i>Identity</i>		
Keep Spanish	-0.121**	(0.053)
Learn English to be American	0.048	(0.073)
Latino is distinct	-0.064	(0.052)
Spanish Quality	0.116**	(0.048)
English Quality	-0.040	(0.037)
2 nd Generation	-0.316	(0.268)
3 rd Generation	-0.344	(0.286)
4 th Generation	-0.405	(0.289)
<i>Controls</i>		
Employed	0.005	(0.031)
Own Home	0.000	(0.057)
Income	-0.003	(0.016)
Interested in Politics	0.006	(0.040)
Political Knowledge	-0.047*	(0.027)
Education	-0.029*	(0.017)
Civic Engagement	0.026	(0.044)
Contact Government	-0.101**	(0.032)
Vote	-0.040	(0.062)
Registered to Vote	-0.037	(0.097)
Democrat	-0.045	(0.058)
Republican	0.773**	(0.084)
US Citizen - Naturalized	-0.170*	(0.098)
US Citizen - Native	0.463	(0.353)
Male	0.035	(0.053)
Age	-0.003	(0.002)
Country Dummy Controls ¹	only Uruguay significant	
Pseudo-R ²	0.0189	
N	5,614	

TABLE 2 NOTES

Source: 2006 Latino National Survey

^asurvey question: "Government is pretty much run by just a few big interests looking out for themselves, and not for the benefit of all people."

Numbers in parentheses indicate standard errors of the parameter estimates.

*p≤.10; **p≤.05

¹The Country Dummy variables included in this model identify the birth country of each respondent. US Birth is the excluded category to which each other Country Dummy is compared. None of these are statistically significant except Uruguay (coef = -1.766**; se = 0.901)

REFERENCES

- Abney, F. G. and J. D. Hutcheson. 1981. "Race, Representation and Trust." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 45: 91-101.
- Abramson, P. R. 1972. "Political Efficacy and Political Trust Among Black Schoolchildren: Two Explanations." *Journal of Politics* 34: 1243-69.
- Abramson, P. R. 1983. *Political Attitudes in America: Formation and Change*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Abramson, P. R. and J. H. Aldrich. 1982. "The Decline of Electoral Participation in America" *American Political Science Review* 72: 502-21.
- Alba, R. D., & Nee, V. (1997). Rethinking assimilation theory for a new era of immigration. *International Migration Review*, 31(4), 826-874.
- Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Boston, MA: Princeton University Press.
- Atkeson, Lonna Rae and Nancy Carrillo. 2007. More is Better: The Influence of Collective Female Descriptive Representation on External Efficacy. *Politics and Gender* 3(1): 79-101.
- Balch, G. I. 1974. "Multiple Indicators in Survey Research: The Concept 'Sense of Political Efficacy'" *Political Methodology* 1: 1-43.
- Banducci, S. A., T. Donovan, and J. A. Karp. 1999. "Minority Representation, Empowerment and Participation." Paper delivered at the annual conference of the Western Political Science Association. Seattle, Wash.
- Barreto, Matt, Gary Segura and Nathan Woods. 2004. "The Effects of Overlapping Majority-Minority Districts on Latino Turnout." *American Political Science Review*. 98 (1): 65-75.
- Bobo, L. and F. D. Gilliam. 1990. "Race, Sociopolitical Participation, and Black Empowerment." *American Political Science Review* 84: 377-93.
- Campbell, A., P. Converse, W. E. Miller, and D. E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: Wiley.
- Campbell, A., G. Gurin and W. E. Miller. 1954. *The Voter Decides*. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson.
- Clark, H.D. and A.C. Acocck. 1989. "National Elections and Political Attitudes: The Case of Political Efficacy" *British Journal of Political Science* 19(4): 551-62.
- Citrin, J., H. McClosky, J.M. Shanks, and P. M. Sniderman. 1975. "Personal and Political Sources of Political Alienation." *British Journal of Political Science* 5: 1-31.
- de la Garza, R. O., and L. DeSipio. 1997. "Save the baby, change the bathwater, and scrub the tub: Latino electoral participation after twenty years of voting rights act coverage." In F.C. Garcia (ed). *Pursuing power: Latinos and the political system* (pp. 72-126). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Finkel, S. E. 1985. "Reciprocal Effects of Participation and Political Efficacy: A Panel Analysis." *American Journal of Political Science* 29: 891-913.
- Finkel, S. E. 1987. "The Effects of Participation on Political Efficacy and Political Support: Evidence from a West German Panel." *Journal of Politics* 49: 441-64.
- Finifter, A. W. 1970. "Dimensions of Political Alienation." *American Political Science Review* 64: 389-410.
- Fraga, L. R., Garcia, J.A., Hero, R., Jones-Correa, M., Martinez-Ebers, V., & Segura, G.M. (2006). Latino National Survey (LNS). Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.
- Gans, H. (1992). Second generation decline: Scenarios for the economic and ethnic futures of post-1965 American emmigrants. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 15, 173-192.
- Hero, R. E. 1992. "Latinos and political understanding: An exploration" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago.

- Highton, B., and Burris, A. 2002. "New perspectives on voter turnout in the United States." *American Politics Research*, 30: 285-306.
- Howell, S. and D. Fagan. 1988. "Race and Trust in Government" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 52: 343-50.
- Jackson, Robert A. 2009. "Latino Political Connectedness and Electoral Participation" *Journal of Political Marketing* 8(3): 233-262.
- Lieberman, S. (1973). Generational differences among blacks in the north. *American Journal of Sociology*, 79, 550-565.
- Long, S. 1978. "Personality and Political Alienation Among White and Black Youth: A Test of the Social Deprivation Model" *Journal of Politics* 40: 433-57.
- Long, J. S., & Freese, J. (2006). *Regression models for categorical and dependent variables using Stata* (2nd ed.). College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.
- Mangum, M. 2003. "Psychological Involvement and Black Voter Turnout" *Political Research Quarterly* 56(1): 41-48.
- Mamani, Amy G. Weisman de, Grace A. Rosales, and Mona Navarro. 2007. "Personal efficacy, attitudes towards immigrants, and voting behavior among Latino and white university students" *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*. 41(3).
- Michelson, M. R. 2000. "Political Efficacy and Electoral Participation of Chicago Latinos" *Social Science Quarterly* 81(1): 136-150.
- Nownes, A. J. 1992. "Primaries, General Elections, and Voter Turnout: A Multinomial Logit Model of the Decision to Vote." *American Politics Quarterly* 20(2): 205-26.
- Pantoja, A. D. and G. M. Segura. 2000. "Does Ethnicity Matter? Descriptive Representation and Political Alienation Among Latinos" *Social Science Quarterly* 84(2): 441-460.
- Pattie, C., and R. Johnston. 1998. "Voter Turnout at the British General Election of 1992: Rational choice, Social Standing, or Political Efficacy?" *European Journal of Political Research* 32(2): 263-83.
- Reilly, Shauna. 2012. "Partisan Identification of Naturalized Americans" *Ohio Journal of Politics and Economics* Vol. 20, No. 1: 74-84.
- Rodgers, H. 1974. "Toward Explanation of the Political Efficacy and Political Cynicism of Black Adolescents: An Exploratory Study." *American Journal of Political Science* 18: 257-82.
- Salzman, Ryan. 2014. "News or Noticias? A Social Identity Approach to Understanding Latinos' Preferred Language for News Consumption in the United States." *Mass Communication and Society* 17(1): 54-73.
- Sanchez, G. R. 2006. "The Role of Group Consciousness in Political Participation Among Latinos in the United States" *American Politics Research* 34: 427-450.
- Uhlaner, C. 1989. "Rational goods and participation: Incorporating sociability into a theory of rational action" *Public Choice*, 62: 253-285.
- Uhlaner, C. J., B. E. Cain, and D. R. Kiewiet. 1989. "Political Participation of Ethnic Minorities in the 1980s." *Political Behavior* 11(3): 195-231.
- Wolfinger, R. E., and S. J. Rosenstone. 1980. *Who Votes?* New Haven: Yale University Press.

¹ The term "Latino" was chosen over the more classic "Hispanic" to denote individuals in the United States of Latin American ancestry. To be clear, both terms represent the same ethnic classification for individuals in the United States.

² Additional information about the LNS can be found at <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/DSDR/studies/20862>

³ Socioeconomic status is an important individual-level characteristic that influences myriad political behaviors. Due to potential inaccuracies in income reporting, the variables *own home* and *employed* are included.